

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Enclosed is a replacement formal drawing sheet 1/16 in which Fig. 1 has been amended to show the reference numeral "3" to identify the "automatic book binding apparatus" described on page 11 of Applicant's specification.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet 1/16

REMARKS

Applicant requests the Examiner to acknowledge and accept the enclosed replacement drawing sheet 1/16 in which Fig. 1 has been amended to contain the reference numeral "3" has described in Applicant's specification at, for example, page 11, lines 1-7.

Examiner Chan issues the following seven (7) statutory prior art rejections.

(1) Claims 1, 2, 4 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by (lacking novelty over) Melton '501;

(2) Claims 3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable (obvious) over Melton '501 in view of Schneider '568;

(3) Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable (obvious) over Melton '501 in view of Koyama '152; ;

(4) Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable (obvious) over Melton '501 in view of Koyama '152 and further in view of Schneider '568; and

(5) Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable (obvious) over Melton '501 in view of Koyama '152;

(6) Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable (obvious) over Melton '501 in view of Tsuchiya '588 and Saotome '105; and

(7) Claims 19, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable (obvious) over Melton '501 in view of Koyama '152 and further in view of Tsuchiya '588 and Saotome '105.

Applicant respectfully **traverses** each of these rejections insofar as these rejections may be applied to the pending claims 1, 3-8, 10-15 and 17-22.

N.B. Applicant has amended the independent claims 1, 4 and 17 to contain the following limitation (or corresponding limitation) from claims 2, 9 and 16 (which have been canceled):

a side edge aligning unit that, before the two photographic prints are bonded together, aligns side edges of the two photographic prints which have been made to abut against each other by the bonding unit.

Thus, Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to the amended claims 1, 4 and 17, and to the Examiner's comments directed to the limitations of original claims 2, 9 and 16 (which now have been canceled).

First, Applicant must respectfully submit that, notwithstanding the Examiner's apparent assertion to the contrary, Melton '501 does not teach, or even suggest, Applicant's claimed "**side edge aligning unit**" or "**section**" that "aligns side edges of the two photographic prints".

Examiner Chan recognizes this lack of teaching or suggestion in Melton '501, but dismisses this deficiency with the following statement occurring in three places in the Office Action, i.e., in rejections (1), (4), and (5), which address the canceled dependent claims 2, 9 and 16:

...the examiner is taking the position [that] the apparatus align[s] all the edges of the webs including the side edges.

The rejection (1) requires that Melton '501 disclose, either expressly or inherently, each limitation of each of claims 1, 2, 4 and 9, or in other words, that each of these claims be readable on Melton's disclosure. As just explained above, Applicant respectfully submits that clearly such is **not** the case here (as Melton does not disclose or even suggest the claimed "side edge aligning unit" or "section"). The same deficiency carries over into rejection (4) and the rejection of claim

16 (whose limitation has been added to claim 4), and also to rejection (5) directed to claim 17 which also has been amended to contain the "side edge aligning section" limitation from canceled claim 16.

Thus, since none of the amended independent claims 1, 4 and 17 is readable on Melton's disclosure, these claims are **incapable of being anticipated** by Melton, whereby Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw rejection (1) as applied to the amended claims 1 and 4.

Rejection (5) requires that the Melton/Koyama '152 combination teach, or at least suggest, **all of the limitations** of the amended claim 17. Again, Applicant respectfully submits that clearly such is **not** the case here, as explained above with regard to the deficiencies in the primary reference, Melton.

Thus, since the amended independent claims 1, 4 and 17 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Melton alone or in combination with any of the other cited references, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all of rejections (1) through (7), and to find the application to be in condition for allowance with all of the presently pending claims 1, 3-8, 10-15 and 17-22; however, if for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to **call the undersigned attorney** to discuss any unresolved issues and to expedite the disposition of the application.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, and any required fee for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any additional fees

under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and/or § 1.17 necessary to keep this application pending in the Patent and Trademark Office or credit any overpayment to said Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

/John H. Mion/
John H. Mion
Registration No. 18,879

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
(202) 663-7901

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 13, 2007